

Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of the claims shall replace all previous versions and listings of the claims.

Listing of Claims

1.-22. (Cancelled)

23. (Currently Amended) A system for promoting exhibits at a trade show, comprising:

a network-connected server storing an exhibit profile for individual ones of a plurality of the exhibits;

a first computerized communication device usable by a first person potentially interested in one or more of the exhibits at the trade show; and

a second computerized communication device usable by an agent for one of the exhibits;

wherein the first person registers a seeker profile with the server, the server compares the seeker profile with stored exhibit profiles and finds one or more matches, and provides a communication address for the second communication device to the first person to contact the agent for the associated exhibit, responsive to finding that the stored exhibit profile for the associated exhibit matches said seeker profile.

24. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 23 wherein one or both of the computerized communication devices are cellular telephones.

25. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 23 wherein the network is the Internet network.

26. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 23 wherein the first computerized communication device is an Internet-capable device, and the first person registers the seeker profile using the first computerized communication device.

27. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 26 wherein the first communication device is an Internet-capable cellular telephone.

28. (Currently Amended) A method for promoting exhibits at a trade show, comprising:

(a) storing an exhibit profile for individual ones of a plurality of the exhibits on a network-connected server;

(b) registering at the server a seeker profile ~~with the server by~~ of a first person having a first computerized communication device;

(c) comparing seeker profiles with exhibit profiles by the server and finding a match between the seeker profile and an individual one of the exhibit profiles; and

(d) responsive to said match, passing a communication address to the first person by the server for a second computerized communication device usable by an agent for the exhibit matched to the seeker profile.

29. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 28 wherein one or both of the computerized communication devices are cellular telephones.
30. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 28 wherein the network for the network-connected server is the Internet network.
31. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 28 wherein the first computerized communication device is an Internet-capable device, and ~~the first person registers~~ the seeker profile is registered using the first computerized communication device.
32. (Currently Amended) The ~~system~~ method of claim 31 wherein the first communication device is an Internet-capable cellular telephone.

Request for Reconsideration

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given this application, as well as for the helpful telephone interview with Applicants' undersigned representative on March 20, 2007. Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 23-32 are now pending in this application, of which Claims 23 and 28 are independent claims. Claims 23, 28, 31, and 32 have been amended. In addition to limitations discussed below, Claims 28 and 31 have been amended such that all operations in the claims are recited in terms of actions to be performed by a server. Claim 32 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error.

To summarize the Interview of March 20, 2007, Applicants' undersigned representative and the Examiner discussed the independent claims in comparison to the cited references, especially Shteyn et al. (see below). One of the arguments discussed was that the beacon signals discussed in Shteyn et al. may contain "connection pointers" for accessing service suppliers (as discussed below) but that this was not done for a *matched* exhibit. It was discussed by the Examiner that the claims, as previously presented, did not make it clear that the passing of a communication address was responsive to the claimed matching, and Applicants' representative was thus led to understand that amending the claims to clarify this would obviate the rejections based on Shteyn et al. The above amendments to Claims 23 and 28 are intended to clarify this.

At pages 3-6, the Office Action rejects Claims 23-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shteyn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,782,253) in view of Borstahl et

al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,180). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 23, as amended, includes the following language: “wherein the first person registers a seeker profile with the server, the server compares the seeker profile with stored exhibit profiles and finds one or more matches, and provides a communication address for the second communication device to the first person to contact the agent for the associated exhibit, responsive to finding that the stored exhibit profile for the associated exhibit matches said seeker profile.” Claim 28, as amended, includes the following language: “responsive to said match, passing a communication address to the first person by the server for a second computerized communication device usable by an agent for the exhibit matched to the seeker profile.”

It is noted that, in view of these amendments, both claims specify that the passing of a communication address is done *in response to a match being identified*. While it may be true, as discussed at col. 8, lines 12-58 of Shteyn et al., that the disclosed beacon signals may include connection pointers for accessing service suppliers (see col. 8, lines 50-54), they are sent *initially, not in response to the matching*, as claimed.

It is further noted that Applicants have not found any teachings or suggestions in Borgstahl et al. that would remedy these deficiencies of Shteyn et al. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 23 and 28, as well as their dependent claims, Claims 24-27 and 29-32, respectively, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action.

However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.